



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| 10/006,266 12/04/2001 Masaaki Isozu 0979290 | 09-5283 | 2060 |
|---------------------------------------------------|----------|--------------|
| | | |
| 26263 7590 02/21/2006 | EXAM | MINER |
| SONNENSCHEIN NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP P.O. BOX 061080 | DOAN, DI | UYEN MY |
| | דואט | PAPER NUMBER |
| CYVC+ CO V | 143 | |

DATE MAILED: 02/21/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| ************************************** | | · | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------|
| | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
| Advisory Action | 10/006,266 | ISOZU ET AL. | |
| Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | Duyen M. Doan | 2143 | |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appe | ars on the cover sheet with the c | correspondence add | ress |
| THE REPLY FILED 26 January 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS A | APPLICATION IN CONDITION FO | R ALLOWANCE. | |
| The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or o this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Not (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in comp following time periods: | owing replies: (1) an amendment, a otice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in liance with 37 CFR 1.114. The rep | ffidavit, or other evide compliance with 37 (| ence, which CFR 41.31; or |
| a) | | e final rejection, whicheve | arie later In no |
| event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later the | an SIX MONTHS from the mailing date o | f the final rejection. | |
| Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f) | | RST REPLY WAS FILE | D WITHIN TWO |
| Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension a CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened stabove, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three month earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL | and the corresponding amount of the fee. atutory period for reply originally set in the | The appropriate extension final Office action; or (2) | on fee under 37 as set forth in (b) |
| 2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in come of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any e Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be | extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e) |), to avoid dismissal o | of the appeal. |
| AMENDMENTS 2. The respected amendment(s) filed offer a final rejection. | but prior to the data of filing a bria | f will not be entered | haariaa |
| The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, They raise new issues that would require further co They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below) They are not deemed to place the application in being the control of the contr | nsideration and/or search (see NO ow); | TE below); | |
| appeal; and/or (d) They present additional claims without canceling a | corresponding number of finally re | elected claims. | |
| NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)). | - | • | |
| 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1 | | ompliant Ameńdment | (PTOL-324). |
| 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s | · —— | | |
| Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a the non-allowable claim(s). | illowable if submitted in a separate | , timely filed amendn | ient canceling |
| 7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: | | vill be entered and an | explanation of |
| Claim(s) allowed: | | | |
| Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-20</u> . | | | |
| Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: | | • | |
| AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE | | | |
| 8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, b because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). | | | |
| 9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar | overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appe | al and/or appellant fa | ils to provide a |
| 10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER | on of the status of the claims after | entry is below or attac | ched. |
| 11. The request for reconsideration has been considered by See Continuation Sheet. | ut does NOT place the application i | in condition for allowa | ince because: |
| 12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). | (PTO/SB/08 or PTQ-1449) Paper | Ng(s) | |

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 7-05)

13. Other: ____.

PRIMARY EXAMINER

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: As regard to applicant argument "the prior art failed to disclose a communication relay device having a session control means for controlling a session status of a data communication session on a first of the plurality of control terminals... and for controlling access to the session in accordance with a processing request received from one of the control terminal". Examiner disagrees; the communication relay device is in the preamble, therefore, given no patentable weight to it.

Bhagavath discloses a technique to store session information such as address and the transition information to allow continuation of the session (see Bhagavath abstract). Further more, Bhagavath discloses using a proxy to control the data about the status of the session, such as timestamp of the session and addresses of the mobile terminal etc... (see Bhagavath col.8, lines 12-42, col.9, lines 1-20). Samadi also discloses a method for allowing ongoing call to continue when a user travels from an area covered by one communication network to an area covered by a different communication network. Samadi's invention put the session on hold in response to a pause request make by a user of one of the end points. When the reconnection request make by the user, the system of Samadi will resume the session where it left off, allowing the user to continuously communicate with the other end device. Clearly, the prior art discloses the limitation of claim 1. Therefore the rejection of claims 1-20 is maintained.

WILLIAM C. VAUGHN, JR. PRIMARY EXAMINER